REMARKS

Status of Application

By the present Amendment, claim 30 has been added. Claims 1-26 and 28-30 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-26 and 28-29 have been rejected.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6, 15-23 and 25-26 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,354,688 to Inoue et al (hereinafter "Inoue") in view of US 6,270,178 to Wada et al (hereinafter "Wada"). Claims 7 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Wada, as applied to claim 3 above, and in view of US 2002/0175962 to Otsuki (hereinafter "Otsuki"). Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Wada and further in view of Otsuki, as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of US 6,692,097 to Arima et al (hereinafter "Arima"). Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Wada, Otsuki, and Arima. Applicant respectfully traverses all of these rejections.

The Examiner was not persuaded by arguments advanced with the Amendment filed on October 7, 2009, that in contrast to the cited references, according to illustrative embodiments consistent with claim 1, even in the case where Nozzle #1 is used to form line #1 and line #100 during print operation, a first correction value that corresponds to line #1 is used for correcting line #1, and a second correction value that corresponds to line #100 is used for correcting line #100. The Examiner also was not persuaded by arguments that, consistent with illustrative embodiments of claim 1, the correction value that corresponds to line #1 and the correction value that corresponds to line #100 may be different from each other.

In response to such arguments, the Examiner alleges that the features upon which the above arguments rely are not recited in the rejected claims. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

However, without conceding to the merits of the Examiner's rejections, claim 1 has been amended, as set forth above, to recite (among other things):

> ...printing a correction pattern by ejecting ink from a plurality of nozzles... a plurality of lines... a first one of the plurality of lines formed with a first one of the plurality of nozzles being adjacent to a second one of the plurality of lines formed with a second one of the plurality of nozzles, and a third one of the plurality of lines being formed with the first one of the plurality of nozzles...
>
> ...wherein the correction values for the first one of the plurality of lines, the second one of the plurality of lines and the third one of the plurality of lines are stored respectively.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, and any combination thereof, fail to teach or suggest all the recitations of claim 1 and, therefore, claim 1 is patentable for *at least* these reasons.

For example, according to amended claim 1, a first one of the plurality of nozzles (e.g., Nozzle # 1) is used to form both "a first one of the plurality of lines" (e.g., line # 1) and "a third one of the plurality of lines" (e.g., line # 100). Claim 1 also recites that during printing, a first respective correction value is used for correcting the first one of the plurality of lines (e.g., line # 1), whereas a second respective correction value is used for correcting the third one of the plurality of lines (e.g., line # 100). Thus, consistent with illustrative embodiments of claim 1, the correction value that corresponds to line #1 and the correction value that corresponds to line #100 may be different from each other.

In sharp contrast to claim 1, in Wada, the density of each line corresponds to each nozzle, and the density of each line is converted into an amount of ink discharged in a single discharge operation of the nozzle (Wada, column 18, lines 38-42). For example, according to Wada, in a case where Nozzle #1 is used to form line #1 and line #100 during print operation, the same correction for Nozzle #1 is made for correcting both line #1 and line #100.

Therefore, exemplary embodiments according to claim 1 achieve numerous nonobvious advantages over Wada and the other cited references. For example, turning back to the above example, since a darkness of line #1 (in the case where line #1 is formed with Nozzle #1) is different from a darkness of line #100 (in the case where line #100 is also formed with Nozzle #1), due to the state of the paper, e.g., the extent of bending of the paper, the darkness is more precisely corrected by exemplary embodiments according to claim 1 than according to the cited references.

Therefore, *at least* in view of the above described distinctions, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over Inoue, Wada, and any combination thereof. Further, the dependent claims 2-23 and 28-29 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

In view of the similarity between the requirements of claims 24-26 and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 demonstrate the patentability of claims 24-26. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claims 24-26 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above.

Thus, the allowance of these claims is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

New Claim

New claim 30 has been added. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 30 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency and by virtue of the recitations set forth therein.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Andrew J. Taska /

Andrew J. Taska
Registration No. 54,666

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860
WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 1, 2010